DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 733 HE 014 420

AUTHOR Minatoya, Lydia Y.; Sedlacek, William E.
TITLE Attitudes of Whites Toward Blacks: A Revision of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS).
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
REPORT NO UM-CC-RR-7-79
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 24p.; For related documents see HE 014 421, and HE 014 424. Best copy available.
AVAILABLE FROM University of Maryland, Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Counseling Center, College Park, MD 20742 ($1.50).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; Blacks; *College Freshmen; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Discrimination; State Universities; Student Attitudes; *Whites
IDENTIFIERS Intimacy; *Situational Attitude Scale (Sedlacek and Brooks); University of Maryland College Park

ABSTRACT

A revised form of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS), the SAS A-14 and SAS B-14, was used to measure the attitudes of 259 incoming white freshmen at the University of Maryland, College Park. The results indicated that the revised form elicited responses that paralleled those reported for the standard SAS. Principal components factor analyses, using squared multiple correlations as communality estimates, were conducted on the combined A and B forms. The factor configurations suggested that students responded to the items in each situation as a unit. The first 10 factors extracted appeared to represent each of the 10 situations. (The situations include: new family in your apartment complex, personnel office announces promotion preferences, children bused to school, union adds new apprentices, best friend engaged, stopped by policeman, neighbor joins swimming pool association, medical school admission slots, neighborhood changes, and financial aid office reserves jobs.) White students tended to react with more negative feelings when situations involved proximity, interaction, or competition with blacks than when race was not specified. All 10 items referring to a situation involving preference in promotions received a more negative response when preference was given to black employees than when the employees' races were unspecified. As in previous SAS administrations, the situation that portrayed an engagement of a best friend (white with black) also elicited highly significant differences by form. Instructions and situations from the revised SAS (SAS-14) are appended. (Author/LB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED208733

# COUNSELING CENTER

## Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Counseling Center

Univ of MD

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NE 014 420

# ATTITUDES OF WHITES TOWARD BLACKS: A REVISION OF THE SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE (SAS)

Lydia Y. Minatoya and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 7-79

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

# ATTITUDES OF WHITES TOWARD BLACKS: A REVISION OF THE SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE

Lydia Y. Minatoya and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 7-79

## Summary

A revised form of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS), the SAS A-14 and SAS B-14, was used to measure the attitudes of 259 incoming white freshmen at the University of Maryland, College Park. The results indicated that the revised form elicited responses which paralleled those reported for the standard SAS.

Principal components factor analyses, using squared multiple correlations as communality estimates, were conducted on the combined A and B forms. The factor configurations suggested that students responded to the items in each situation as a unit. The first ten factors extracted appeared to represent each of the ten situations.

White students tended to react with more negative feelings when situations involved proximity, interaction, or competition with Blacks than when race was not specified. All ten items referring to a situation involving preference in promotions received a more negative response when preference was given to black employees than when the employees' races were unspecified. As in previous SAS administrations, the situation which portrayed an engagement of a best friend also elicited highly significant differences by form.

The civil rights movement of the 1960's initiated a major redefining of assumptions about the "place" of Blacks in America. As traditionally "invisible" groups began to demand inclusion, society was forced to recognize the unsettling implication that our principles of equality and justice had eroded into a pattern of limited application. The growing acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the demand for social equality precipitated passage of civil rights legislation, and exclusionary practices could no longer flourish with impunity.

The recognition that, for too long, minorities had been underrepresented in enrollment figures, prompted higher education to initiate recruitment programs. However, despite attempts to remediate racial imbalance, relatively few Blacks entered large universities. Indeed, the upward black enrollment trend of the late sixties and early seventies appears not only to have leveled off, but even to be declining (Sedlacek, Brooks & Horowitz, 1972; Sedlacek, Brooks, & Mindus, 1973 a; Sedlacek, Merritt & Brooks, 1975; Sedlacek & Pelham, 1976; Sedlacek & Webster, 1978)

Merely increasing the numbers of Blacks on traditionally white campuses can not be viewed, conscionably, as a panacea for prejudice. Research has attempted to examine more subtle variables such as attitudes of whites toward minority group members. Measurement of attitudes toward Blacks, however, became fraught with difficulty as the social desirability of appearing unprejudiced increased. Investigators found a positive social set had developed among whites for endorsing attitudes of racial "tolerance" (Sigall and Page, 1970; Sedlacek and Brooks, 1971). When white students were asked to indicate how their peer group felt towards people with a variety of values, students indicated that "racist" and "bigot" were viewed most negatively (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1971). It therefore became imperative that research address the issue of whether racial attitudes were actually becoming as benevolent as expressed by white respondents, or whether social climate was inducing whites to mask their attitudes toward Blacks.

The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was developed by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970) as an attempt to study whether racial attitudes could be measured in a manner which acknowledged and addressed the potential bias due to response set. Studying responses to specific situations, and measuring half the subjects with neutral instruments and half with instruments which identified the situation as involving Blacks, Sedlacek and Brooks found that the insertion of the word "black" into a personal or social situation elicited different, and generally more negative, responses than when race was not mentioned.

Subsequent studies involving adaptations of the original form of the SAS found that attitudes toward Blacks tend to vary with the situation, with whites responding more favorably towards Blacks in service occupations and less favorably towards Blacks in situations requiring close personal contact (Rovner and Sedlacek, 1974). Attitudes towards Blacks also were found to be influenced by the sex of the respondents, with females reacting more negatively to situations where potential fear of physical or sexual harm is involved (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1972 a).

If attitude is related to situation, then as situations involving interracial contact become less alien to whites, the situations which elicit feelings should also change. For example, the white college student of 1970 may have felt that standing on a bus while black persons were seated was an unusual or disquieting situation, but a white college student of today might find less personal relevance, i.e. react more neutrally, in the same situation. Therefore it is important to update the instrument if items are not to become useless in assessing interracial attitudes.

The purpose of this study was to continue to measure the attitudes of white students towards Blacks with a revised version of the SAS. This version retains two of the original situations: being stopped by a policeman and the engagement of a friend, while including eight new situations which deal with occupational and

educational opportunity and social interaction.

## Method

The SAS employs semantic differential items. Form A describes situations with no mention of race, while Form B uses the same situations but includes the word "black." The instrument has been described fully elsewhere in the literature (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970, 1972b, 1976). Briefly, on each form, 10 parallel situations are described, and for each situation, 10 corresponding sets of bi-polar adjectives (e.g., happy-sad) are supplied, yielding a total of 100 items (see Table 1).

The revised form of the SAS was administered anonymously to 259 (144 males and 115 females) incoming white freshmen at the University of Maryland, College Park. Respondents were not aware that two forms of the instrument existed, and forms were randomly assigned to students.

Results were examined by a two-way analysis of variance (.05 level) for each of the 100 items, with sex and form as main effects. Principal components factor analyses, using squared multiple correlations as communality estimates, were conducted on the combined A and B forms. Those factors with eigenvalues greater than one were rotated to a varimax solution.

## Results

Fifty-nine of the 100 items showed significant differences between the neutral and race-explicit form, thereby providing some evidence for the validity of the instrument (see Table 1). Twenty-five items were significantly different by sex of the respondent and three items showed significant differences on the interaction by form and sex.

The results generally indicate that white students tended to react more negatively to situations where the word "black" is inserted than where race is unspecified. All ten items referring to the new situation "your personnel office

announces that current employees will be given preference in all promotions" were answered more negatively when "black employees" were given preference. Other situations which elicited a large number of significant differences by form dealt with educational and vocational opportunities and the engagement of a best friend.

The factor configurations indicated that the students tended to respond to the ten items in each situation as a unit. The first factor extracted for each situation appeared to represent total reaction for that situation as positive or negative. In other words, the specific terminology used in each bi-polar scale item was relatively unimportant. For example "happy...sad" was used five times in different situations (items 7, 28, 42, 62, 72). The median correlation among these five items was .20 (reflecting sign), whereas the median intercorrelation of each of these items with others in the same situation was .55. Therefore, as long as the word scale used generally connoted a positive-negative dimension, the specific words used did not appear to be critical. The median communality for combined forms A and B was .60, which may be viewed as a conservative representation of the internal consistency of the instrument.

## Discussion

This study provides evidence that a revised form of the SAS continues to report findings which parallel the original version of the instrument. White students generally continue to respond more negatively to situations which involve Blacks than to situations where race is not specified. Previous studies have suggested that while whites tend to endorse the concept of integration, they do not tend to endorse actions which would further integrate their own environment; that is, whites may tend to view integration as a process, detached from their lives, in which they need not be involved (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1976 ; Minatoya & Sedlacek, in press). The negative response to items dealing with the engagement of a friend to a black, which has been consistently found in SAS studies, may reflect the feeling that "integration is going too far when it affects meaningful areas of my life."

Sedlacek, Brooks and Mindus (1973b) found that parents felt more negative toward black neighbors than did students. In the present study, the neighborhood situations appeared to generate differences by form that were less pronounced than situations dealing with the engagement of a friend or with educational and occupational opportunities. Perhaps, for students who are leaving home and entering the university, the concept of "neighborhood" is more distant than it is for their parents, while the students' personal involvement is higher in situations which involve friendship, courtship, and achievement of educational and vocational goals. It is possible that items dealing with situations in their residence hall, fraternity or sorority might elicit feelings more accurately comparable to their parents' feelings about neighborhoods. It could also be that neighborhood integration has progressed to the point where it is no longer considered a threat. This is an area which deserves continued investigation.

The situation dealing with the busing of school children to a new area is notable in its lack of significant differentiation by form. This is the only situation represented in the survey which evidences so little variability. It is possible, however, that the issue of busing implies association with Blacks, and that both Forms A and B may be measuring attitudes toward Blacks. White students may be finding the term "black" on Form B to be redundant if they feel busing implicitly involves interracial contact.

Women tended to react less favorably than men to items I, VII & IX, which dealt with increased social proximity. The women may have been expressing feelings of greater vulnerability than the men in that they tended to endorse more strongly adjectives such as "unsafe," "bad," "unfriendly," "suspicious," and "nervous." Women also tended to react less favorably than men, and by form, to the "objectionable," "suspicious," and "disturbing" aspects of these situations. Sedlacek and Brooks (1972b) found that, with the original SAS, females reacted more negatively than men to situations where there was a potential fear of physical harm, i.e., a salesman appears at your door in the evening. One possible interpretation

of the current differences by sex and the interaction of sex and form, may be that the women felt increased social proximity to "strangers", and to black strangers, might increase their susceptibility to threat.

The situation "you are stopped by a policeman" continues to elicit more feelings of "calm", "trust", "safety", "pleasantness" and "cooperation" when the officer is defined as black than when the situation is racially neutral. This sense of ease may be related also to the respondents' tendency to endorse more strongly the feeling of "superior" when the officer is black. While the reaction of the women to this situation also differs significantly by form in the pattern just described, the womens' reactions also differed from the men's within both forms. Women were more apt to rate their feelings as less "calm", more "inferior", and less "smart" than men rated theirs. This may be reflective of the socialization of men to appear "in command of the situation" and of women to feel more passive.

For higher education, the implication that attitudes toward blacks may differ by situation is a cogent one. To have positive feelings toward blacks in service positions is not startling behavior; it is reminiscent of the traditional, patronizing fondness for one's loyal maid or headwaiter. It appears that, while not without authority, the police officer continues to be society's public "servant".

Sedlacek and Minatoya (in press) found two-thirds of white freshmen reported they had a teacher of another race "only a few times", "once" or "never". The university may generate cognitive dissonance, therefore, in white students when they find blacks as peers or professors or in other situations far from the traditional service role. How this dissonance is handled may be an important educative variable and is deserving of attention and examination. The white freshman may react to the perhaps unfamiliar image of blacks achieving in academic and occupational and social roles by retreating further into stereotyping. One way of dealing with the disquieting image is to discredit it. Therefore the student may react with

feelings such as "that black student couldn't have deserved a better grade than I; the professor must be giving him a break and ruining the curve for me", or "this black professor can't really be qualified; it must be affirmative action bringing down hiring standards". However, another reaction to the disequilibrium could be a growth in recognition of members of other races as individuals with unique competencies and foibles. The university environment abounds with opportunities to educate, both within and beyond the classroom. Using research, program planning, evaluation and re-design, higher education could have a significant impact on how interacial contact is received. Clearly, the difference between entrenchment and growth is too important to be left to chance.

References

Minatoya, L.Y. and Sedlacek, W.E. Background and attitude toward interracial contact: A profile of black and white university students. Integrated Education, (in press).

Rovner, R. and Sedlacek, W.E. The study of a simplified version of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS). Cultural Study Center Research Report # 7-74. College Park, Md.: University of Maryland, 1974.

Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27, 971-980.

Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. Social acceptability in the measurement of racial attitudes. Psychological Reports, 1971, 29, 17-18.

Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. Differences in racial attitudes of white males and females. Cultural Study Research Report # 2-72. College Park, Md.: University of Maryland, 1972 a.

Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) Manual. Chicago: Natresources, 1972b. (Now published by the University of Maryland, College Park).

Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. Racism in American Education: A model for change. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Sedlacek, W.E., Brooks, G.C., Jr., & Horowitz, J.L. Black admissions to large universities: Are things changing? Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13, 305-310.

Sedlacek, W.E., Brooks, G.C., Jr., & Mindus, L.A. Black and other minority admissions to large universities: Three-year national trends. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973a, 14, 16-21.

Sedlacek, W.E., Brooks, G.C., Jr.. & Mindus, L.A. Racial attitudes of white university students and their parents. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973 b, 14, 517-520.

References (Continued)

Sedlacek, W.E., Merritt, M.S., & Brooks, G.C., Jr. A national comparison of universities successful and unsuccessful in enrolling blacks over a five-year period. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 16, 57-63.

Sedlacek, W.E. and Pelham, J.C. Minority admissions to large universities: A seven-year national survey. Cultural Study Center Research Report # 1-76. College Park, Md.: University of Maryland, 1976.

Sedlacek, W.E. and Webster, D.W. Admission and retention of minority students in large universities. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1978, 19, 242-248,

Sigal, H. and Page, R. Two looks at stereotypes. APA Proceedings, 1970, 5, 355-356.

Table 1.

INSTRUCTONS AND SITUATIONS FROM THE REVISED SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE (SAS-14)*

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionniare measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal situations. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous, so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date.

happy | A | B | C | D | E | sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select (B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you will feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

| FORM A | FORM B |
|---|---|
| I. A new family moves into the all-white apartment complex where you live. | A new black family moves into the all-white apartment complex where you live. |
| II. Your personnel office announces that current employees will be given preference in all promotions. | Your personnel office announces that current minority employess will be given preference in all promotions. |
| III. You learn that the children on your block are to be bused to a school in a new neighborhood. | You learn that the children on your bloc are to be bused to a school in a new black neighborhood. |
| IV. The elctrician's union has decided to expand its training program by adding 15% more new apprentices. | The electrician's union has decided to expand its training program by adding 15% more new black apprenctices. |
| V. Your best friend just became engaged. | Your best friend just became engaged to a black person |

Table 1. (continued)

INSTRUCTIONS AND SITUATIONS FROM THE REVISED SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE (SAS-14)*

SITUATIONS (continued)

| FORM A | FORM B |
|---|---|
| VI. You are stopped for speeding by a policeman. | You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman. |
| VII. A new neighbor asks to join the swimming pool association. | A new black neighbor asks to join the swimming pool association. |
| VIII. Your state university's medical school has set aside 10% of its admissions slots for local students. | Your state university's medical school has set aside 10% of its admission slots for minority students. |
| IX. You discover that your neighborhood now has over 25% new residents. | You discover that your neighborhood now has over 25% black residents. |
| X. You go to the financial aid office to apply for a part-time job and are informed that the remainder of the positions have been reserved for new students. | You go to the financial aid office to apply for a part-time job and are informed that the remainder of the positions have been reserved for new minority students. |

* Revised 1978, William E. Sedlacek and Lois M. Wright

Table 2.

Means*, Standard Deviations and Analyses of Variance

| ITEM # | SITUATIONS<br>Bipolar Adjective Dimension | MALE<br>Form A (N=84)<br>Mean | <br>S.D. | <br>Form B (N=57)<br>Mean | <br>S.D. | FEMALE<br>Form A (N=57)<br>Mean | <br>S.D. | <br>Form B (N=58)<br>Mean | <br>S.D. | Differences Significant at .05** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I NEW FAMILY IN YOUR APARTMENT COMPLEX | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | good-bad | 1.48 | 1.95 | .87 | .93 | 1.91 | 1.02 | 1.70 | 1.02 | F, S |
| 2. | safe-unsafe | 1.53 | .82 | 1.00 | .92 | 1.57 | 1.05 | 1.36 | 1.08 | S |
| 3. | angry-not angry | 2.79 | 1.15 | 3.52 | .94 | 2.85 | 1.14 | 3.08 | 1.01 | S |
| 4. | friendly-unfriendly | 1.08 | .89 | .66 | .85 | 1.29 | .94 | 1.12 | .89 | F, S |
| 5. | sympathetic-not sympathetic | 1.97 | .94 | 1.94 | 1.40 | 2.07 | 1.08 | 2.12 | 1.17 | |
| 6. | nervous-calm | 2.64 | 1.13 | 3.03 | .99 | 2.59 | 1.11 | 2.63 | 1.16 | |
| 7. | happy-sad | 1.66 | .66 | 1.24 | .89 | 1.94 | .95 | 1.77 | .85 | |
| 8. | objectionable - acceptable | 2.57 | 1.10 | 3.38 | .94 | 2.57 | 1.16 | 2.98 | 1.08 | F, S |
| 9. | desirable-undesirable | 1.71 | .75 | 1.42 | .86 | 1.96 | .90 | 2.00 | .83 | S |
| 10. | suspicious-trusting | 1.92 | .91 | 2.73 | .85 | 2.19 | 1.18 | 2.48 | 1.06 | S, FxS |
| | II PERSONNEL OFFICE ANNOUNCES PROMOTION PREFERENCES | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | understanding-indignant | 1.40 | 1.30 | 1.38 | 1.29 | 3.22 | .90 | 3.05 | 1.16 | F |
| 12. | unfair-fair | 2.45 | 1.27 | 2.45 | 1.37 | .74 | 1.15 | .60 | 1.10 | F |
| 13. | good-bad | 1.66 | 1.29 | 1.59 | 1.26 | 3.24 | .95 | 3.15 | 1.12 | F |
| 14. | pleased-angry | 1.60 | 1.22 | 1.71 | 1.19 | 3.29 | .90 | 3.10 | 1.10 | F |
| 15. | tolerable-intolerable | 1.45 | 1.11 | 1.36 | 1.15 | 2.82 | 1.19 | 2.87 | 1.21 | F |
| 16. | right-wrong | 1.71 | 1.16 | 1.70 | 1.29 | 3.36 | .93 | 3.10 | 1.34 | F |
| 17. | justified-unjustified | 1.65 | 1.19 | 1.45 | 1.26 | 3.08 | 1.02 | 2.82 | 1.27 | F |
| 18. | accepting-resentful | 1.34 | 1.14 | 1.33 | 1.12 | 2.94 | 1.10 | 2.86 | 1.19 | F |
| 19. | safe-fearful | 1.47 | .96 | 1.42 | 1.06 | 2.35 | 1.02 | 2.17 | 1.23 | F |
| 20. | empathic-can't understand | 1.63 | 1.10 | 1.42 | 1.13 | 2.70 | 1.20 | 2.44 | 1.21 | F |



* Scale 0 to 4

** Results of 2 way ANOVA (fixed effects with Form) (form A or B) and Sex (male or female) as main effects and FxS as the interaction

Table 2 - continued

Means*, Standard Deviations and Analyses of Variance

| ITEM # | SITUATIONS / Bipolar Adjective Dimensions | MALE | | | | FEMALE | | | | Differences Significant at .05 ** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Form A (N=84) Mean | S.D. | Form B (N=57) Mean | S.D. | Form A (N=57) Mean | S.D. | Form B (N=58) Mean | S.D. | |
| | III. CHILDREN BUSED TO SCHOOL | | | | | | | | | |
| 21. | fair-unfair | 3.00 | 1.11 | 2.84 | 1.36 | 3.03 | 1.10 | 3.01 | 1.05 | |
| 22. | hopeful-hopeless | 2.26 | 1.14 | 2.07 | 1.11 | 2.43 | 1.14 | 2.27 | 1.07 | |
| 23. | excited-unexcited | 2.72 | 1.22 | 2.56 | 1.21 | 2.85 | 1.14 | 2.91 | 1.14 | |
| 24. | pleased-angered | 2.97 | .98 | 2.82 | 1.10 | 2.89 | 1.04 | 2.98 | .90 | |
| 25. | love-hate | 2.47 | .96 | 2.35 | .87 | 2.70 | .98 | 2.31 | .79 | S |
| 26. | disinterested-interested | 2.70 | 1.34 | 2.85 | 1.18 | 2.47 | 1.47 | 2.94 | 1.11 | |
| 27. | tolerable-intolerable | 2.32 | 1.21 | 2.26 | 1.20 | 2.54 | 1.19 | 2.41 | 1.18 | |
| 28. | sad-happy | 1.28 | 1.00 | 1.49 | .92 | 1.31 | 1.12 | 1.27 | .85 | |
| 29. | empathic-can't understand | 2.30 | 1.22 | 2.14 | 1.23 | 2.38 | 1.26 | 2.41 | 1.17 | |
| 30. | objectionable - acceptable | 1.21 | 1.30 | 1.33 | 1.27 | 1.14 | 1.23 | 1.20 | 1.18 | |
| | IV. UNION ADDS NEW APPRENTICES | | | | | | | | | |
| 31. | approving-disapproving | .94 | .97 | .92 | .94 | 1.59 | 1.39 | 1.63 | 1.10 | F |
| 32. | pleased-angered | 1.09 | .93 | 1.15 | .84 | 1.98 | 1.24 | 1.84 | 1.00 | F |
| 33. | sympathetic-unsympathetic | 1.41 | .99 | 1.87 | .88 | 1.98 | 1.21 | 2.06 | 1.02 | F, S |
| 34. | desirable-undesirable | 1.28 | .87 | 1.33 | .83 | 1.94 | 1.18 | 1.94 | .98 | F |
| 35. | undisturbed- disturbed | 1.17 | 1.04 | 1.22 | 1.14 | 1.82 | 1.42 | 1.62 | 1.26 | F |
| 36. | threatened-neutral | 2.88 | 1.23 | 3.10 | 1.23 | 2.47 | 1.35 | 2.74 | 1.22 | F |
| 37. | fair-unfair | 1.23 | 1.00 | 1.24 | 1.07 | 2.28 | 1.26 | 2.08 | 1.31 | F |
| 38. | friendly-hostile | 1.34 | .91 | 1.45 | .94 | 1.80 | 1.20 | 1.44 | 1.12 | |
| 39. | excited-unexcited | 2.03 | 1.05 | 2.52 | 1.16 | 2.54 | 1.81 | 2.60 | 1.00 | F, S |
| 40. | tolerant-intolerant | 1.42 | 1.07 | 1.17 | .92 | 1.63 | 1.29 | 1.48 | 1.06 | |

* Scale 0 to 4

** Results of 2 way ANOVA (fixed effects with Form) (Form A or B) and sex (male or female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction

13.

Table 2 - continued

Means*, Standard Deviations and Analyses of Variance

| ITEM # | SITUATIONS / Bipolar Adjective Dimensions | MALE Form A (N=84) Mean | MALE Form A (N=84) S.D. | MALE Form B (N=57) Mean | MALE Form B (N=57) S.D. | FEMALE Form A (N=57) Mean | FEMALE Form A (N=57) S.D. | FEMALE Form B (N=58) Mean | FEMALE Form B (N=58) S.D. | Differences Significant at .05** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V. BEST FRIEND ENGAGED | | | | | | | | | |
| 41. | agressive-passive | 2.03 | 1.28 | 1.84 | 1.23 | 2.10 | 1.41 | 2.29 | 1.27 | |
| 42. | happy-sad | .76 | 1.10 | .57 | 1.03 | 1.80 | 1.35 | 2.00 | 1.33 | F |
| 43. | tolerable-intolerable | .73 | .90 | .59 | .94 | 1.66 | 1.41 | 1.29 | 1.22 | F |
| 44. | complimented-insulted | 1.14 | .95 | 1.17 | 1.01 | 1.89 | 1.12 | 1.86 | .86 | F |
| 45. | angered-overjoyed | 3.13 | .87 | 3.05 | 1.20 | 1.92 | 1.20 | 2.12 | 1.04 | F |
| 46. | secure-fearful | 1.30 | 1.01 | 1.54 | 1.26 | 1.71 | 1.14 | 1.98 | 1.29 | F |
| 47. | hopeful-hopeless | .93 | 1.00 | .61 | .88 | 1.87 | 1.33 | 1.56 | 1.25 | F |
| 48. | excited-unexcited | .75 | .81 | .49 | .86 | 1.94 | 1.28 | 1.70 | 1.33 | F |
| 49. | right-wrong | 1.11 | 1.06 | 1.08 | 1.13 | 1.84 | 1.25 | 2.00 | 1.16 | F |
| 50. | disgusted-pleased | 3.23 | .97 | 3.29 | 1.06 | 2.07 | 1.22 | 2.17 | 1.15 | F |
| | VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN | | | | | | | | | |
| 51. | calm-nervous | 2.85 | 1.28 | 3.49 | 1.00 | 2.12 | 1.52 | 2.79 | 1.34 | F, S |
| 52. | trusting-suspicious | 2.16 | 1.30 | 2.47 | .98 | 1.12 | 1.18 | 1.00 | .99 | F |
| 53. | afraid-safe | 1.48 | 1.28 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 2.36 | 1.39 | 2.29 | 1.43 | F |
| 54. | friendly-unfriendly | 1.08 | 1.19 | 1.21 | 1.11 | .88 | 1.16 | .89 | .98 | |
| 55. | tolerant-intolerant | 1.13 | 1.20 | 1.31 | 1.05 | .87 | 1.11 | 1.03 | 1.21 | |
| 56. | bitter-pleasant | 1.86 | 1.36 | 2.01 | 1.12 | 2.54 | 1.08 | 2.55 | 1.30 | F |
| 57. | cooperative-uncooperative | .82 | 1.07 | .45 | .73 | .68 | 1.00 | .44 | .77 | S |
| 58. | acceptive-belligerent | 1.23 | 1.12 | 1.05 | 1.09 | .91 | 1.09 | .63 | .85 | F |
| 59. | inferior-superior | 1.69 | 1.05 | 1.29 | 1.03 | 1.91 | .63 | 1.79 | .66 | F, S |
| 60. | smarter-dumber | 1.96 | .96 | 2.47 | .90 | 1.89 | .69 | 2.13 | .47 | S |

* Scale 0 to 4

** Results of 2-way ANOVA (fixed effects with Form (Form A or B) and Sex (male or female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction

Table 2 - Continued

Means*, Standard Deviations and Analyses of Variance

| ITEM # | SITUATIONS / Bipolar Adjective Dimensions | MALE Form A (N=84) Mean | MALE Form A (N=84) S.D. | MALE Form B (N=57) Mean | MALE Form B (N=57) S.D. | FEMALE Form A (N=57) Mean | FEMALE Form A (N=57) S.D. | FEMALE Form B (N=58) Mean | FEMALE Form B (N=58) S.D. | Differences Significant at .05** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | VII NEIGHBOR JOINS SWIMMING POOL ASSOCIATION | | | | | | | | | |
| 61. | warm-cold | .86 | .91 | .61 | .83 | 1.28 | 1.11 | 1.08 | .94 | F |
| 62. | sad-happy | 2.76 | 1.09 | 3.24 | .82 | 2.35 | 1.07 | 2.67 | .92 | F, S |
| 63. | approving-disapproving | 1.03 | 1.02 | .54 | .80 | 1.29 | 1.11 | .91 | .97 | F, S |
| 64. | threatened-neutral | 2.86 | 1.11 | 3.42 | 1.10 | 2.85 | 1.14 | 3.37 | .95 | S |
| 65. | pleased-displeased | .98 | .92 | .75 | .89 | 1.59 | 1.09 | 1.29 | .95 | F |
| 66. | understanding-indifferent | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.19 | 1.35 | 1.36 | 1.26 | 1.27 | 1.34 | |
| 67. | undesirable-desirable | 2.70 | 1.06 | 3.08 | 1.00 | 2.45 | 1.07 | 2.51 | 1.07 | F |
| 68. | disappointed-elated | 2.53 | 1.03 | 2.61 | .83 | 2.15 | .95 | 2.22 | .75 | F |
| 69. | fair-unfair | 1.05 | .91 | .57 | .82 | 1.19 | 1.14 | .72 | .93 | S |
| 70. | comfortable-uncomfortable | 1.10 | .99 | .91 | 1.12 | 1.38 | 1.19 | 1.20 | 1.07 | |
| | VIII MEDICAL SCHOOL ADMISSIONS SLOTS | | | | | | | | | |
| 71. | surpising-not surprising | 2.22 | 1.48 | 2.50 | 1.47 | 2.91 | 1.47 | 3.48 | .86 | |
| 72. | sad-happy | 2.27 | .97 | 2.36 | 1.07 | 1.57 | 1.17 | 1.43 | 1.41 | F, S |
| 73. | disinterested-interested | 2.30 | 1.15 | 2.50 | 1.29 | 2.63 | 1.24 | 2.75 | 1.01 | F |
| 74. | fair-unfair | 1.86 | 1.29 | 1.63 | 1.31 | 2.64 | 1.43 | 2.67 | 1.32 | |
| 75. | understandable-baffling | 1.57 | 1.22 | 1.24 | 1.19 | 1.94 | 1.51 | 2.00 | 1.27 | F |
| 76. | friendly-hostile | 1.59 | 1.08 | 1.57 | 1.03 | 2.24 | 1.19 | 2.00 | 1.27 | F |
| 77. | concerned-unconcerned | 1.51 | 1.25 | 1.38 | 1.11 | 1.28 | 1.13 | 1.12 | 1.18 | F |
| 78. | desirable-undesirable | 1.70 | 1.21 | 1.70 | 1.23 | 2.61 | 1.26 | 2.44 | 1.21 | |
| 79. | pleased-angered | 1.77 | 1.26 | 1.49 | 1.11 | 2.73 | 1.06 | 2.65 | 1.10 | F |
| 80. | comfortable-uncomfortable | 1.80 | 1.21 | 1.52 | 1.16 | 2.22 | 1.25 | 2.05 | 1.28 | F |

* Scale 0 to 4

** Results of 2-way ANOVA (fixed effects with Form) (Form A or B) and Sex (male or female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction

Table 2. - continued

Means*, Standard Deviations and Analyses of Variance

| ITEM # | SITUATIONS / Bipolar Adjective Dimensions | MALE Form A (N=84) Mean | MALE Form A (N=84) S.D. | MALE Form B (N=57) Mean | MALE Form B (N=57) S.D. | FEMALE Form A (N=57) Mean | FEMALE Form A (N=57) S.D. | FEMALE Form B (N=58) Mean | FEMALE Form B (N=58) S.D. | Differences Significant at .05** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | IX NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGES | | | | | | | | | |
| 81. | bad-good | 1.80 | 1.05 | 2.05 | 1.18 | 1.61 | .99 | 1.84 | .85 | F |
| 82. | understanding-indifferent | 2.09 | .96 | 2.17 | 1.42 | 2.03 | 1.23 | 2.24 | 1.24 | |
| 83. | suspicious-trusting | 1.95 | .91 | 2.29 | 1.11 | 2.07 | 1.03 | 1.98 | 1.16 | |
| 84. | safe-unsafe | 2.13 | .94 | 1.64 | 1.09 | 2.00 | 1.14 | 2.00 | 1.10 | S |
| 85. | disturbed-undisturbed | 1.88 | 1.05 | 2.54 | 1.21 | 2.10 | 1.24 | 2.10 | 1.22 | S, FxS |
| 86. | desirable-undesirable | 2.13 | 1.10 | 1.85 | 1.12 | 2.35 | 1.09 | 2.34 | .92 | F |
| 87. | nervous-calm | 2.15 | 1.04 | 2.71 | 1.04 | 2.07 | 1.14 | 2.17 | 1.25 | S |
| 88. | angry-not angry | 2.26 | 1.12 | 2.94 | 1.09 | 2.21 | 1.24 | 2.53 | 1.17 | S |
| 89. | displeased-pleased | 1.95 | 1.02 | 2.35 | 1.09 | 1.75 | 1.02 | 1.67 | .86 | F |
| 90. | acceptable-objectionable | 1.73 | 1.04 | .94 | .98 | 1.75 | 1.19 | 1.60 | 1.32 | S, FxS |
| | X FINANCIAL AID OFFICE RESERVES JOBS | | | | | | | | | |
| 91. | angered-pleased | 1.14 | 1.24 | .61 | .86 | .75 | 1.09 | .55 | .84 | F, S |
| 92. | tolerable-intolerable | 2.21 | 1.32 | 2.54 | 1.10 | 2.91 | 1.24 | 2.74 | 1.34 | F |
| 93. | hostile-indifferent | 1.65 | 1.08 | 1.61 | .94 | 1.31 | 1.15 | 1.44 | 1.12 | |
| 94. | sympathetic-not sympathetic | 2.66 | 1.06 | 2.88 | 1.07 | 2.92 | 1.22 | 2.94 | 1.13 | |
| 95. | objectionable-acceptable | 1.40 | 1.22 | 1.10 | .97 | 1.00 | 1.19 | .91 | 1.08 | F |
| 96. | fair-unfair | 2.65 | 1.24 | 2.96 | .99 | 3.03 | 1.13 | 3.18 | .99 | F |
| 97. | indignant-understanding | 1.63 | 1.02 | 1.45 | 1.10 | 1.35 | 1.27 | 1.17 | .93 | F |
| 98. | good-bad | 2.46 | 1.21 | 2.70 | 1.03 | 2.91 | 1.24 | 3.08 | .99 | F |
| 99. | wrong-right | 1.47 | 1.17 | 1.26 | .89 | .96 | 1.08 | 1.01 | 1.10 | F |
| 100. | not resentful - resentful | 2.54 | 1.21 | 2.68 | .92 | 2.92 | 1.01 | 2.67 | 1.24 | |

* Scale 0 to 4

** Results of 2-way ANOVA (fixed effects with Form ) (Form A or B) and Sex (male or female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction